

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,321,266 to Yokomizo ("Yokomizo"); rejected claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,814,512 to Kato ("Kato"); rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizo in combination with U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0048473 to Rosen ("Rosen"); and rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokomizo in combination with U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0054344 to Tateyama ("Tateyama").

By this Reply, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-3 and 10, without prejudice or disclaimer, amended claims 4-9, and added a new claim 11. Claims 4-9 and 11 are now pending. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants traverse the rejection of the pending claims.

**A. § 102(e) Rejection of Claims 2, 3, and 10**

Applicants traverse the § 102(e) rejection of claims 2, 3, and 10. Claims 2, 3 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and therefore the rejection of these claims is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claims 2, 3, and 10 based on Yokomizo.

**B. § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 6-9**

Applicants traverse the § 102(b) rejection of claims 6-9. Claims 6-9 have been amended and in view of the amendments, Applicants traverse the § 102(b) rejection of these claims for at least the reason that Kato fails to disclose every claim element recited in these claims.

Kato discloses “an image-forming-job managing apparatus” which “includes a communication section which executes communication with at least one second image-forming apparatus connected thereto via a communication line, and a job storage which sequentially stores image-forming jobs issued from a terminal.” Kato, Abstract.

However, Kato fails to disclose “a control unit obtaining a list of a plurality of feasible image processes performed by the second image processing unit; a search key input unit inputting a search key for a user to retrieve a desirable image process among the plurality of image processes; a search unit retrieving at least one image process from the list of the plurality of feasible image processes using the search key input by the search key input unit; and a search result display unit displaying information related to the image process retrieved by the search unit,” as recited by amended independent claim 6.

As an initial matter, in spite of the Examiner’s allegation, Kato fails to disclose “a control unit obtaining a list of a plurality of feasible image processes performed by the second image processing unit,” as recited by amended independent claim 6. The portions, such as Column 6, Lines 21-29, Column 4, Lines 47-55, and Fig. 8 of Kato, cited by the Examiner to allege the anticipation of the above-cited feature, merely disclose a system that allows a user to select a server among a plurality of print servers. However, nowhere in Kato does it disclose the claimed “list of a plurality of feasible image processes performed by the second image processing unit.” Indeed, Kato is completely silent about the claimed “image processes.”

Furthermore, because Kato does not disclose “a list of a plurality of feasible image processes,” it can not disclose “a search key input unit inputting a search key for

a user to retrieve a desirable image process among the plurality of image processes,” and “a search unit retrieving at least one image process from the list of the plurality of feasible image processes using the search key input by the search key input unit,” as recited by amended independent claim 6. In addition, Kato also fails to disclose several other features in the above-cited element of amended independent claim 3, including “search key” and “search key input unit.” Accordingly, Kato further fails to disclose “a search result display unit displaying information related to the image process retrieved by the search unit,” as recited by amended independent claim 6.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Kato fails to disclose every claim element recited in amended independent claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of amended independent claim 6 based on Kato.

Dependent claims 7-9 depend from amended independent claim 6. Thus, dependent claims 7-9 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of amended dependent claims 7-9.

**C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 4, and 5**

Applicants traverse the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 based on Yokomizo in combination with Rosen, and the § 103(a) rejection of claim 4 and 5 based on Yokomizo in combination with Tateyama. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and therefore the rejection of these claims is now moot. Applicants have amended dependent claim 4 into an independent claim, and amended dependent claim 5. In view of the amendments, Applicants traverse the § 103(a) rejection of these

claims for at least the reason that Yokomizo, taken alone or in combination with Yateyama, fails to teach or suggest every claim element recited in this claim.

For example, in spite of the Examiner's allegation, Yokomizo, taken alone or in combination with Yateyama, does not teach or suggest at least "an image processing unit obtaining a sample image by performing the image process designated from the operation input unit for an original image received from the image printing apparatus," and "a display control unit displaying an designation picture for the image process on the display unit on the basis of the information from the image printing apparatus, wherein the display control unit displays the sample image on the display unit of the image printing apparatus on the basis of the information transmitted by the transmission unit," as recited by amended independent claim 4.

Yokomizo is completely silent about "a sample image" and "the image process designated from the operation input unit." The Examiner also contended that Yokomizo "does not expressly disclose a sample image obtained by causing said operation unit to perform an image process designated by the user for an original image." Office Action at 13. However, the Examiner asserted that Yateyama taught or suggested the above-cited features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner cited Page 11, Para. 244 of Yateyama and asserted that the cited portion taught the claimed "sample image". However, the portion cited by the Examiner only discloses calculating the actual processing time required for converting the sample image data. Other portions of Yateyama teach several steps of "data conversion processing," for example, including a "JPEG decompression processing," an "image correction processing," a "color processing", a "UCR (Under Color Removal)

processing,” and a “half-toning processing.” Yateyama, Page 10, Para. 232 - Page 11, Para. 239. However, nowhere in Yateyama does it teach or suggest “the sample image” is obtained “by performing the image process designated from the operation input unit for an original image received from the image printing apparatus,” as recited in independent claim 4. For at least reasons set forth above, Yateyama fails to cure the deficiencies of Yokomizo.

Therefore, Yokomizo, taken alone or in combination with Yateyama, does not teach or suggest at least “an image processing unit obtaining a sample image by performing the image process designated from the operation input unit for an original image received from the image printing apparatus.”

Furthermore, because Yokomizo fails to teach or suggest “the sample image,” it can not teach or suggest “the display control unit displays the sample image on the display unit of the image printing apparatus on the basis of the information transmitted by the transmission unit,” as recited by amended independent claim 4. In addition, Yateyama does not disclose the recited limitations of “the sample image,” or the claimed “display unit of the image printing apparatus,” and thus it can not teach or suggest the above-cited features of amended independent claim 4. For this additional reason, Yokomizo, taken alone or in combination with Yateyama, does not teach or suggest every element of amended independent claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of amended independent claim 4 based on Yateyama.

Dependent claim 5 depends from amended independent claim 4. Thus, dependent claim 5 is allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable

independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of amended dependent claim 5.

**D. New Claim 11**

Applicants have added new independent claim 11, support of which can be found at Fig. 1-12 and their related descriptions in the specification. New independent claim 11, while of different scope as compared to independent claim 6, includes a recitation of “a search key input unit inputting a search key for a user to retrieve a desirable image process among the plurality of image processes,” “a search unit retrieving at least one image process from the list of the plurality of feasible image processes using the search key input by the search key input unit; and a search result display unit displaying information related to the image process retrieved by the search unit,” and “a display unit displaying information related to the image process retrieved by the search unit on an operation screen on the basis of the retrieved result that is returned,” similar to those of independent claim 6. For at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 6, Applicants respectfully request allowance of new independent claim 11.

**E. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 24, 2008

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220  
(571) 203-2735